



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/840,129

05/05/2004

Raymond Heidel

41286-00036

7232

7590

07/18/2006

Sung I. Oh
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey
14th Floor
801 S. Figueroa
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5554

EXAMINER

SHAPIRO, JEFFERY A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3653

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/840,129	HEIDEL, RAYMOND	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey A. Shapiro	3653	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 26-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 26-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/26/06 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katou et al (US 2004/0182677A1) in view of Tedesco (US 2002/0065579A1).

As described in Claims 26-30, Katou et al discloses a note validator (30), a validator processor (35) with memory (107d), a note box (60, 80 and 81), a temporary storage hopper (40), a transportation unit (501a-h), (502a-b), (503a-c), (504), (901a-e), (902a-e) and (903a-e), the notes being sent through validator (30) in either direction (501b). Note that the deposit/withdrawal port (20) can be construed as the validator opening, with the entire structure (1) being construed as the validator. Note also that bill discrimination unit (30) can be construed as inherently sensing actual bill pattern

Art Unit: 3653

information for comparison with template patterns stored in memory (107d) and as inherently determining the value of bills detected as received and dispensed by the apparatus.

Katou does not expressly disclose, but Tedesco discloses a vending machine embodied as an automated teller machine (ATM). See Tedesco paragraph 60 and figure 2.

Both Katou and Tedesco are analogous art because they both concern currency handling, including paper money handling.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have embodied Katou's ATM as a combination ATM/vending machine that dispenses snacks and goods as well as handles bank transactions.

The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to make profits at an ATM point of sale, as suggested by Tedesco's teaching and disclosure. See Tedesco paragraph 60 and figure 2. One ordinarily skilled in the art would have recognized the benefit of combining an ATM and vending machine because customers obtaining money at the ATM may be more willing to make impulsive purchases, thereby resulting in increased sales of vended goods as compared to a free-standing vending machine.

4. Claims 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graef et al (US 6,315,194 B1) in view of Paulucci et al (US 2002/0004690 A1).

As described in Claims 26-30, Graef et al discloses a note validator (72 and 258), a validator processor (254) with memory (256) (see also Graef col. 6, lines 10-25), a note

Art Unit: 3653

box (30, 32, 34, 36, 38 and 40), of which any of said note boxes can be used as a temporary storage hopper, a transportation unit (17, 192, 285) (see also figures 12-15), the notes being sent through validator (72 or 258) in either direction. Note that the deposit/withdrawal port (20) can be construed as the validator opening, with the entire structure (10) being construed as the validator. Note also that bill discrimination/validator unit (72 and 258) can be construed as inherently sensing actual bill pattern information for comparison with template patterns stored in memory such as (256) and as inherently determining the value of bills detected as received and dispensed by the apparatus. See also Graef, col. 14, lines 11-55.

Graef does not expressly disclose, but Paulucci discloses a vending machine embodied as an automated teller machine (ATM). See Paulucci paragraphs 80-83 and figures 5 and 7. Note that paragraph 83 refers to an ATM controlling a vending device (72) through processor/control software (70,72).

Both Graef and Paulucci are analogous art because they both concern currency handling, including paper money handling.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have embodied Graef's ATM as a combination ATM/vending machine that dispenses snacks and goods as well as handles bank transactions.

The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to make profits at an ATM point of sale, as suggested by Paulucci's teaching and disclosure. See Paulucci paragraphs 80-83 and figures 5 and 7. One ordinarily skilled in the art would have recognized the benefit of combining an ATM and vending machine because customers obtaining

Art Unit: 3653

money at the ATM may be more willing to make impulsive purchases, thereby resulting in increased sales of vended goods as compared to a free-standing vending machine.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 26-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

As described above, both Tedesco and Paulucci describe combining an ATM with a vending machine. It is therefore follows that it would have been obvious to combine Katou's ATM and bill path devices with Tedesco's vending machine or to combine Graef's ATM and bill path devices with Paulucci's vending machine.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey A. Shapiro whose telephone number is (571)272-6943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gene O. Crawford can be reached on (571)272-6911. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3653

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



JAS

July 8, 2006



GENE C. CRAWFORD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER